



General Assembly

Distr.: General
22 August 2005

Original: English

Sixtieth session

Item 100 (a) of the provisional agenda*

**Review of the implementation of the recommendations and
decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth
special session: Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters**

Work of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

The Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters held its forty-fourth and forty-fifth sessions in New York from 23 to 25 February 2005 and in Geneva from 29 June to 1 July 2005, respectively. The Board focused its deliberations on: (a) nuclear fuel cycle and fissile material control; (b) regional security and global norms: small arms and light weapons; (c) challenges and opportunities at the regional level in the areas of weapons of mass destruction and conventional arms; and (d) a review of the disarmament machinery.

The Board made several recommendations on the issue of nuclear fuel cycle and fissile material control: (a) nearer-term opportunities for multilateral nuclear approaches as based on voluntary participation should be considered; (b) further elaboration should be undertaken on the recommendation of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change on a voluntary moratorium on building any further facilities matched by the guaranteed supply of fissile material; (c) the existing approaches and instruments should be fully utilized to strengthen the security of fissile material; and (d) all States with advanced nuclear programmes, whether parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or not, should participate actively in the efforts of the international community to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The Board made the following recommendations on small arms and light weapons: (a) the High-level Plenary Meeting of the sixtieth session of the General Assembly in September 2005 should give high priority to the challenge posed by small arms and light weapons; (b) the second Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate

* A/60/150.



the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, to be held in 2005, and the first review conference on the Implementation of the Programme of Action on Small Arms, to be held in 2006, should aim at expanding and deepening global norms governing small arms and light weapons; (c) the United Nations should lead in enhancing the inclusive process encompassing the global, regional, national and civil society levels in order to succeed in the collective efforts to address the threat posed by small arms and light weapons; and (d) coordination and cooperation should be strengthened at the international level, including between the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as between the United Nations and relevant financial institutions such as the World Bank and regional development banks, in order to tackle the small arms and light weapons problem in all its aspects in a comprehensive and integrated manner.

On the issue of challenges and opportunities at the regional level in the areas of weapons of mass destruction and conventional arms, the Board recommended, among other things, that interregional dialogue be undertaken to share information and exchange successful experiences and lessons learned and that cooperation between the regional organizations or mechanisms be established or strengthened to promote disarmament and non-proliferation.

With regard to the disarmament machinery, the Board recommended that the Conference on Disarmament be preserved and strengthened without prejudice to adjustments in its procedural arrangements that could facilitate progress in the consideration of disarmament measures. It also recommended that the functioning of the First Committee be improved so that it might effectively address both traditional and current security challenges facing the international community, in particular in the fields of disarmament and non-proliferation.

In its capacity as Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), the Board approved for submission to the General Assembly the report of the Director of the Institute on its activities from August 2004 to July 2005 and the programme of work and budget for 2006 (see A/60/135).

After considering the Office of Internal Oversight Services audit report on UNIDIR, in particular the recommendations made in that report, the Board recommended the following: (a) the costs of the core staff of UNIDIR should be funded from the regular budget of the United Nations; (b) in consultation with the Office of Human Resources Management and the United Nations Office at Geneva Human Resources Management Service, UNIDIR should explore options to apply gradually the United Nations staff regulations and rules to all its staff; and (c) in that connection, UNIDIR should establish specific posts for the core functions and project posts, classify them and ensure competitive selection for the posts.

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	1-3	4
II. Substantive discussions and recommendations	4-40	4
A. Nuclear fuel cycle and fissile material control	4-12	4
Recommendations	11	5
B. Regional security and global norms: small arms and light weapons	13-19	6
Recommendations	19	7
C. Challenges and opportunities at the regional level in the areas of weapons of mass destruction and conventional arms	20-32	8
Recommendations	32	9
D. Review of the disarmament machinery	33-40	10
Recommendations	40	10
III. Meeting with the Secretary-General	41	11
IV. Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research	42-53	11
Recommendations	51	12
V. United Nations Disarmament Information Programme	54-55	13
VI. Future work	56	13
VII. Conclusion	57-59	13
Annex		
Members of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters		14

I. Introduction

1. The Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters held its forty-fourth and forty-fifth sessions in New York from 23 to 25 February 2005 and in Geneva from 29 June to 1 July 2005, respectively. The present report is submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 38/183 O of 20 December 1983. The report of the Board on its work as Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) has been presented in a separate document (A/60/135).
2. Vicente Berasategui of Argentina chaired the two sessions of the Board in 2005.
3. The present report summarizes the Board's deliberations during the two sessions and the specific recommendations it conveyed to the Secretary-General.

II. Substantive discussions and recommendations

A. Nuclear fuel cycle and fissile material control

4. At its forty-fourth session, the Board received discussion papers prepared by two members, Harald Mueller and Mahmoud Karem. It was also briefed by Frank von Hippel, Professor of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, on the subject of global stocks of fissile material. The Board also took into account the report *Multilateral Approaches to the Nuclear Fuel Cycle* of the Expert Group commissioned by the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).
5. The Board expressed the hope that the 2005 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in May would yield tangible results in advancing the goals of the Treaty. Many members underlined the need to maintain a balance among the various obligations enshrined in the Treaty, in particular those related to non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament and peaceful uses of nuclear energy.
6. The Board expressed grave concern at the prospects that nuclear proliferation could take on a new impetus as it was possible for a number of States to acquire nuclear weapons under the cover of peaceful nuclear activities. The related threats that might arise from the action of terrorists or non-State actors added to their concern. It underlined the different types of proliferation challenges that this represented and the urgency of addressing these developments.
7. Many members emphasized that the acquisition of nuclear technologies by a non-nuclear-weapon State party to the Treaty with the intention to use them later for military purposes would be acting in bad faith and was therefore illegal.
8. The Board recognized that the construction of sensitive fuel cycle facilities might exacerbate regional instabilities, while the creation of multilateral nuclear approaches, on a regional or universal basis, could offer many non-proliferation benefits: the number of sensitive facilities and activities would be fewer and the points of potential access to fissile material for non-State actors would be reduced.

Between the participants, cooperation and the ensuing transparency would help build confidence and additional barriers to break-out would be erected.

9. However, multilateral nuclear approaches are no panacea for existing cases of non-compliance or for the need to enforce non-proliferation commitments determinedly; and while they may serve to draw States not parties to the Treaty closer to the nuclear non-proliferation regime, they cannot solve the long-standing issue of the lack of universality, nor do they guarantee full participation and cooperation by such States in multilateral nuclear approaches.

10. The Board noted that agreement on multilateral nuclear approaches, while upholding article IV of the Treaty, would involve complex political, legal, institutional and economic issues. Nevertheless, a multilateral arrangement for nuclear fuel assurances was not beyond reach. In such an arrangement, a majority of participating suppliers would have to waive case-by-case licensing in favour of generic consent to inform all participating recipients in good standing of their non-proliferation undertakings, including the Additional Protocol, export controls, appropriate physical security and technical safety standards. IAEA, as the main agency entrusted with facilitating cooperation in the field of the peaceful use of nuclear energy, would be the most adequate body to determine such "good standing". In addition, a multinational spent fuel interim repository could be a realistic possibility in the not-too-distant future.

Recommendations

11. **The Board made the following recommendations:**

(a) **Those nearer-term opportunities for multilateral nuclear approaches as based on voluntary participation should be considered. To turn the renunciation by States of their national fuel cycle facilities into a universal norm, a re-balancing of the rights and obligations under the Treaty, including additional nuclear disarmament, would be implied, since such a step would change the content of article IV. This is conceivable only as a universal rule applying to all States and could be based on a fissile material cut-off that would terminate the global production of fissile material for weapon purposes;**

(b) **Further elaboration is needed on the recommendation by the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change on a voluntary moratorium on building any further facilities matched by the guaranteed supply of fissile material, which was also a recommendation made by the Advisory Board to the Panel;**

(c) **Without prejudice to further consideration of those ideas, existing approaches and instruments should be fully utilized to strengthen the security of fissile material. They include export controls, measures taken by the Security Council, such as those adopted under resolution 1540 (2004), the widest possible adherence to the Model Additional Protocol to IAEA safeguards and the intensification of the Global Threat Reduction Initiative;**

(d) **All States with advanced nuclear programmes, whether parties or non-parties to the Treaty, should participate actively in the efforts of the international community to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.**

12. At its forty-fifth session, the Board received a presentation by one of its members, Harald Mueller, who was also a member of the IAEA Expert Group on multilateral nuclear approaches. His comments pointed to four particular features in the IAEA Expert Group report and the related discussions in the Treaty Review Conference and references in the report of the Secretary-General, "In larger freedom: towards security, development and human rights for all" (A/59/2005):

(a) Paragraph 73 of the report of the IAEA Expert Group qualifies the term "guarantor" of fuel supply. The last sentence says that in all guarantor functions, the agency will need to rely on the cooperation of other actors, such as Governments and companies. This is clarified in order to avoid the illusion that the IAEA could single-handedly solve the problem of fuel assurances;

(b) The same paragraph also points to the fact that supplier Governments must adjust their supply policies and export control law to help IAEA with the job as guarantor. This is then spelled out in paragraph 26, which outlines the requirements of such a fuel assurance system. It is quite demanding for the exporter countries;

(c) In paragraphs 322 to 325, the Expert Group makes it clear that currently only a voluntary approach that works through incentives and not through fear or pressure, can be considered. If the move from a voluntary to a binding norm is to be made, then a readjustment of the whole Treaty would be in order and required;

(d) Paragraphs 326 and 327 address the issue of the nuclear-weapon States and States not parties to the Treaty participating in multilateral nuclear approaches. Having these States not parties to the Treaty as recipients of a supply system would mean a change in the export control policies of the members of the Nuclear Supplier Group and all States parties to the Treaty;

(e) At the 2005 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty, it became clear how difficult it was to achieve consensus. Some States parties emphasized that priority should be accorded to the use of existing instruments rather than the invention of new ones while existing ones, such as the Additional Protocol, were not adequately used. Others asked for fuel assurances to be an additional element in the whole system, without any reciprocal renunciation of national fissile facilities by those who could join such a fuel assurance system. There were sceptical interventions doubting the non-proliferation benefits of multilateral nuclear approaches. Only one country supported explicitly the idea of a moratorium;

(f) The Secretary-General's report "In larger freedom" followed closely the IAEA Expert Group report on this issue. There was no reference to the need to negotiate immediately an instrument on multilateral nuclear approaches. The Secretary-General emphasized the voluntary character of present multilateral nuclear approaches activities and noted that the concept of the guarantor was one option among many.

B. Regional security and global norms: small arms and light weapons

13. The Board had before it discussion papers prepared by two members, U. Joy Ogwu and Kuniko Inoguchi. It was also briefed by Wendy Cukier, Associate Dean, Faculty of Business, Ryerson University, Canada, on current and future efforts of

the International Action Network on Small Arms in combating threats posed by the proliferation of small arms and light weapons.

14. The Board concluded once more that the proliferation and misuse of small arms and light weapons threatened the realization of basic human security and human rights in various ways. Small arms and light weapons were closely associated with intra-State conflicts, the collapse of the rule of law, increased levels of crime, bad governance, poverty and lack of public welfare infrastructure.

15. Noting that the report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change discussed the issue of small arms and light weapons only briefly, the Board stressed the need to alert the international community to the continuing threat and challenges of proliferation and misuse of small arms and light weapons, the category of weapons that kills the largest number of people.

16. It noted that the United Nations had taken important first steps in developing global norms in a relatively short period of time. The adoption of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects was a major development, but the success of those norms depended heavily on the implementation of political and legal instruments and substantial international financial and technical assistance and cooperation.

17. The Board recognized with satisfaction the increasingly important role played by regional and subregional organizations in combating the scourge of small arms and light weapons. It emphasized the need for States, the United Nations system and other international organizations to support such efforts.

18. The Board equally recognized the critical and effective role of civil society, including non-governmental organizations, at the global and the local levels and invited them to continue to work closely with States, the United Nations and other international organizations.

Recommendations

19. **The Board made several recommendations:**

(a) **The High-level Plenary Meeting of the sixtieth session of the General Assembly in September 2005 should give high priority to the challenge posed by small arms and light weapons;**

(b) **Global norms on small arms and light weapons should be further developed with a view to enhancing regional security and reconciliation processes in post-conflict situations. In this regard, the second Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, to be held in 2005, and the first review conference on the Implementation of the Programme of Action on Small Arms, to be held in 2006, should aim at expanding and deepening global norms governing small arms and light weapons;**

(c) **The United Nations should lead in enhancing the inclusive process encompassing the global, regional, national and civil society levels in order to succeed in the collective efforts to address the threat of small arms and light weapons;**

(d) Coordination and cooperation should be strengthened at the international level, including between the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as between the United Nations and relevant financial institutions, such as the World Bank and regional development banks, in order to tackle the small arms and light weapons problem in all its aspects in a comprehensive and integrated approach.

C. Challenges and opportunities at the regional level in the areas of weapons of mass destruction and conventional arms

20. Three members, Gelson Fonseca, Jr., Ho-Jin Lee, and Michael Clarke, presented discussion papers at the session. The Board heard a briefing by Eric Berman, Managing Director of the Small Arms Survey, on the topic "Subregional approach to small arms-related issues: some reflections from experience in Africa".

21. The Board recognized that regional and subregional approaches were complementary to global efforts and that they played an important role in contributing to the achievement of global disarmament and non-proliferation goals.

22. The Board noted that the post-cold war era provided opportunities for more dynamic regional and subregional approaches to disarmament and non-proliferation. These should lead to concurrent negotiations on more comprehensive and global measures leading to general and complete disarmament. It also noted that the challenges and opportunities encompassed a triad of issues: nuclear weapons; chemical and biological weapons; and conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons and improvised explosive devices.

23. The Board believed that the engagement of major players in resolving regional problems might be necessary in some cases and thus required consistency in both their policies and actions in addressing disarmament and non-proliferation issues.

24. The Board stressed that the nuclear issue of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea posed daunting challenges to global and regional peace and security and must be addressed without further delay in accordance with global norms of nuclear non-proliferation.

25. It emphasized that the urgent resumption of the six-party talks was essential for that purpose and that the participation of all key players and addressing their concerns were crucial to the success of those talks.

26. The Board observed that, in the long run, the establishment of a viable regional multilateral architecture for security dialogue and cooperation in North-East Asia could make a valuable contribution to ensuring stability and sustainable economic growth in the region.

27. It was noted that the nuclear programme of the Islamic Republic of Iran, as developed so far, raised serious concerns relating to the preservation of the non-proliferation regime and must be fully addressed in the light of those concerns.

28. In the case of Latin America, the Board noted that the encouraging progress in building the region into a zone of peace resulted from a combination of several factors: overcoming traditional bilateral rivalries, democratization, a complete legal framework of non-proliferation concerning weapons of mass destruction, adherence to multilateralism, peaceful settlement of disputes, low military expenditure (1.3 per

cent of gross national product) and the absence of inter-State conflicts, thus creating a virtuous cycle of democracy, multilateralism and peace.

29. It further noted that regional instruments developing a comprehensive system of confidence-building measures and the multiplication of regional multilateral forums at which the purposes of peace and security were constantly reaffirmed contributed significantly to the success of maintaining peace and security in the region.

30. In the case of Africa, the Board observed that in recent years there had been a dynamic application of regional and subregional approaches in tackling the proliferation and misuse of small arms and light weapons.

31. The Board noted with satisfaction the important role played by civil society in this regard.

Recommendations

32. The Board made the following recommendations:

(a) Regional arrangements for disarmament should contribute to increasing security and stability in the region at the lowest possible level of armaments and armed forces and on the basis of undiminished security for all the participating States;

(b) Regional approaches should lead to assessing the regional challenges and opportunities in terms of three particular dimensions: the spectrum of proliferation; regional stability in the global context; and the effect of global norms on regional non-proliferation;

(c) Due to their high degree of differentiation, regions and subregions should tailor approaches to their own unique situations;

(d) Interregional dialogue should be undertaken to share information and to exchange successful experiences and lessons learned. Cooperation between regional organizations or mechanisms should be established or strengthened to promote disarmament and non-proliferation;

(e) The six-party talks on the nuclear issues of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should be resumed urgently in order to search for a solution to that problem. The parties concerned should give consideration to the establishment of a viable regional multilateral architecture for security dialogue and cooperation in North-East Asia, which would make valuable contributions to ensuring stability and sustained economic growth for the region;

(f) A comprehensive and integral approach should be adopted in addressing the threat posed by small arms and light weapons and, in this connection, the issues of poverty, rivalries over resources control, governance and social and political justice should be addressed with urgency;

(g) Political and financial support from outside Africa for civil society in the region should be provided on an urgent basis;

(h) High priority should be accorded by the General Assembly at the forthcoming High-level Plenary Meeting of the sixtieth session of the General Assembly in September to the implementation of the Programme of Action on Small Arms.

D. Review of the disarmament machinery

33. The Board had before it discussion papers prepared by three members, Elisabeth Borsiin Bonnier, Perla Carvalho Soto and Anatoly I. Antonov. It was also briefed by Susi Snyder, Secretary General of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, on the topic "Assessing the state of the international disarmament machinery".

34. The Board reviewed the issue of the disarmament machinery in the light of the current international situation. Several members were of the view that this issue should be viewed from a broader perspective.

35. The view that the current stalemate in multilateral disarmament and non-proliferation negotiations resulted from the international political situation rather than the functioning of the disarmament machinery was expressed.

36. The Board stressed the essential requisite of retaining and enhancing the role of the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral negotiating body of the international community, without prejudice to adjustments in its procedural arrangements that could facilitate progress in the consideration of disarmament measures. Several ideas were put forward concerning the need to review the existing procedural arrangements such as grouping and decision-making, including the need to prevent abuse of the rule of consensus and the establishment of subsidiary bodies.

37. Views were expressed on the relevance of the Disarmament Commission, with some members supporting continuation with its current mandate and others expressing the view that its functions might be taken up by the First Committee or a subsidiary body of that Committee.

38. The Board welcomed the progress made in improving the functioning of the First Committee and encouraged its members to enhance its capabilities to deal with security concerns and its responsibility on developing strategic areas for multilateral disarmament efforts.

39. Some members were of the view that the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission was created in exceptional circumstances and that, accordingly, it would be unlikely that consensus be achieved for its permanent functioning. No objections were raised to other arrangements to ensure the implementation of Security Council resolutions.

Recommendations

40. **The Board made the following recommendations:**

(a) **The Conference on Disarmament, as the single multilateral negotiating body of the international community, should be preserved and strengthened without prejudice to adjustments in its procedural arrangements that could facilitate progress in the consideration of disarmament measures;**

(b) **The functioning of the First Committee should be improved so that it can effectively address both traditional and current security challenges facing the international community, in particular, in the fields of disarmament and non-proliferation.**

III. Meeting with the Secretary-General

41. The Board met with the Secretary-General on 24 February 2005. Following statements by the Chairman and the Secretary-General, members of the Board discussed subjects of major concern, including: the need for urgent and firm collective action against nuclear proliferation in order to prevent the situation from deteriorating into a multiple-crisis scenario in the future; the role of the Security Council as the ultimate guarantor of non-proliferation regimes related to weapons of mass destruction and the need to fully utilize the existing treaty regimes in combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; the need for the forthcoming High-level Plenary Meeting in September to renew commitments by Member States to pursue both disarmament and non-proliferation goals, with an emphasis on cooperative rather than coercive solutions; the need to strike a balance between peace, security and development within a strengthened multilateral framework; the issue of small arms and light weapons, which should be accorded higher priority in United Nations efforts to tackle peace and security challenges; the key role that success in disarmament efforts could play in advancing the Millennium Development Goals; progress in seeking political solutions and in confidence-building measures as a precursor to disarmament; and non-proliferation in the regional context.

IV. Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research

42. At its forty-fourth session, the Board heard an oral report of the Director of UNIDIR on the implementation of the Institute's programme and budget in 2004. The Director also reported on the consideration of the Institute's programme and budget by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee during the fifty-ninth session of the General Assembly, in particular on the request of a subvention for the Institute. Taking note of the comments by the Advisory Committee, the Board formally adopted the 2005 programme budget for UNIDIR.

43. The Board expressed its satisfaction that the General Assembly approved the UNIDIR subvention for the year 2005. It stressed that it was essential to continue to provide the subvention from the regular budget of the United Nations in order to maintain the Institute's neutrality and independence.

44. In accordance with the decision made at the fortieth session of the Board, the Chairman appointed a subcommittee on UNIDIR. The subcommittee met on 28 June to consider issues related to the programme of work of the Institute.

45. At the subcommittee meeting, after the Director's introduction of the Institute's overall activities and programme of work, members heard detailed presentations by the Institute's staff on several of its key projects, on subjects such as "European action on small arms, light weapons and explosive remnants of war", "Capacity development for reporting to the United Nations Programme of Action on Small Arms", "Disarmament as humanitarian action: making multilateral negotiations work", and "Working our way to a nuclear-weapons-free world". The subcommittee also reviewed an audit report on UNIDIR by the United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services.

46. Members of the subcommittee were satisfied that having such a direct interaction with staff from the Institute was very important in gaining an in-depth understanding of the projects and research activities undertaken by the Institute, as well as in providing guidance for its future plans.

47. At a plenary meeting of its forty-fifth session, the Board heard the report of the Director of UNIDIR on the activities of the Institute during the period from August 2004 to July 2005, the planned activities for 2006 and beyond and its programme of work. It also received a report on the subcommittee's activities by its rapporteur, Harald Mueller.

48. At both sessions, the Board noted with satisfaction that UNIDIR, under the leadership of its Director, Patricia Lewis, was carrying out impressive and relevant work with limited resources. The Institute had a dynamic research programme covering a wide range of topical and emerging issues in the area of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation. The Board reiterated its call for greater support of its valuable work by Member States.

49. Members of the Board put forward ideas and proposals for UNIDIR to consider in planning its future research activities. They included: new issues such as information security and cyberwarfare; more emphasis on cooperative security; disarmament, demobilization and reintegration in Afghanistan; ways and means to enhance public awareness of disarmament and non-proliferation; formulating an outreach and media strategy; and the development of results-based programme budgeting.

50. The Board, pursuant to article III, paragraph 2 (b), of the statute of the Institute, reviewed and approved, for submission to the General Assembly, the programme of work and budget of the Institute for 2006 (see A/60/135). It strongly appealed for the continuation of the United Nations subvention and annual cost adjustments for the Institute.

Recommendations

51. After considering the audit report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services, in particular the recommendations made in that report, the Board recommended the following:

(a) The costs of the core staff of UNIDIR should be funded by the regular budget of the United Nations;

(b) In consultation with the Office of Human Resources Management and the United Nations Office at Geneva Human Resources Management Service, UNIDIR should explore options to apply gradually the United Nations staff regulations and rules to all its staff;

(c) In that connection, UNIDIR should establish specific posts for the core functions and project posts, classify them and ensure competitive selection for those posts.

52. The Board agreed that specific posts should be established to carry out core functions in the following areas: administrative assistance, publications administration, computer systems management, research projects and publication management, conference organization, fund-raising assistance and book and journal editing.

53. The Board stressed, however, that in order to ensure the independence of UNIDIR, the selection of personnel should be left to the Director of the Institute.

V. United Nations Disarmament Information Programme

54. The Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Nobuyasu Abe, briefed the Board at both sessions on the activities of the United Nations Disarmament Information Programme.

55. The Board heard presentations from representatives of several non-governmental organizations during both of its 2005 sessions and, following these presentations, had an interactive discussion with the representatives from the non-governmental organizations community on those issues.

VI. Future work

56. The Board decided to include the following items on the agenda of its forty-sixth session, to be held in New York in February 2006:

(a) Review of the situation in the field of disarmament in the light of the decisions taken by the High-level Plenary Meeting of the sixtieth session of the General Assembly;

(b) Measures to prevent the proliferation of weapon systems to non-State actors.

VII. Conclusion

57. The Board considered recent developments in the fields of disarmament and non-proliferation in the light of the current international situation and expressed deep concern over the lack of results on a number of critical issues. It noted that those developments threatened the basic principles of multilateralism and reaffirmed the need to renew and strengthen the commitment by all States to those principles.

58. Many members specifically regretted the failure of the 2005 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to achieve consensus on the important subjects before the Conference. They emphasized that it was urgent for States parties to renew their commitments to Treaty principles on non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament and the right of States to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

59. The Board stressed the urgent need to make progress on measures of disarmament and related questions, including those concerning non-State actors, in order to prevent a weakening of the present system of legal norms on disarmament and non-proliferation.

Annex

Members of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters

Vicente Berasategui (Chair)

Ambassador

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Buenos Aires

Christiane Isabelle Agboton Johnson

President

Movement against Small Arms in West Africa

Dakar

Anatoly I. Antonov

Director, Department for Security and Disarmament

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation

Moscow

Pascal Boniface

Director

Institute of International and Strategic Relations (IRIS)

Paris

Elisabeth Borsiin Bonnier

Permanent Representative of Sweden to the United Nations Office at Geneva

Geneva

Perla Carvalho Soto

Ambassador of Mexico to Uruguay

Montevideo

Professor Michael Clarke

Director, International Policy Institute

School of Social Science and Public Policy

King's College London

London

Gelson Fonseca, Jr.

Ambassador of Brazil to Chile

Santiago

Hasmy Agam

Ambassador-at-Large

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Malaysia

Putrajaya, Malaysia

Kuniko Inoguchi, Ph.D

Special Assistant to the Minister for Foreign Affairs in Japan

Professor, Faculty of Law

Sophia University

Tokyo

Jeremy Issacharoff
Deputy Director-General for Strategic Affairs
Strategic Affairs Division
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Israel
Jerusalem

Mahmoud Karem
Ambassador of Egypt to Belgium and Luxembourg
and Permanent Representative to the European Union
Brussels

Ho-Jin Lee
Ambassador of the Republic of Korea to Hungary
Embassy of the Republic of Korea
Budapest

Mr. Liu Jieyi^a
Director-General
Department of Arms Control Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the
People's Republic of China
Beijing

Maleeha Lodhi
High Commissioner of Pakistan to the United Kingdom
London

Professor Harald Mueler
Director
Frankfurt Peace Research Institute
Frankfurt, Germany

Professor U. Joy Ogwu
Director-General
Nigerian Institute of International Affairs
Lagos, Nigeria

Jayant Prasad^b
Permanent Representative of India to the Conference on Disarmament
Geneva

Stephen G. Rademaker
Assistant Secretary of State for Arms Control
United States Department of State
Washington, D.C.

Jill Sinclair
Special Coordinator, Middle East Peace Process
Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade of Canada
Tel Aviv, Israel

Kongit Sinegiorgis
Director-General for African Affairs
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
Addis Ababa

Rakesh Sood^a
Ambassador of India in Afghanistan (designate)
Embassy of India
Kabul

Tibor Tóth
Permanent Representative of Hungary to the United Nations Office
and Other International Organizations at Geneva
Geneva

Zhang Yan^b
Ambassador
Director-General, Department of Arms Control
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China
Beijing

Patricia Lewis (ex-officio member)
Director
United Nation Institute for Disarmament Research
Geneva

Notes

^a Resigned from the Board after the forty-fourth session.

^b Joined the Board at the forty-fifth session.